335
py 1

AN UNOFFICIAL INTERPRETATION OF THE WAR AIMS OF THE UNITED STATES.

By Burt Etheridge Barlow.

AN UNOFFICIAL INTERPRETATION OF THE WAR AIMS OF THE UNITED STATES

By BURT ETHERIDGE BARLOW

QH619
.B35

By Transfer
SEP 1 1917

I.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A NATIONAL PRINCIPLE.

The development of ideas of government goes forward very slowly. And so with our country, the seed was planted when the oppressed peoples of Europe sought our shores to find freedom of religious thought and escape from political tyranny. Being left to themselves their government became for themselves and, in the course of a hundred years, what at first was permissive had become in their eyes an absolute right. When, therefore, they became rich enough to invite exploitation, their ideas as to freedom of government were so thoroughly fixed as to cause resistance.

The declaration of independence can hardly be called the work of one man or a number of men, so far as the ideas expressed are concerned, but is rather a most able statement of the commonly accepted ideas of the people of the colonies.

They, the people, believed that all men were created equal; that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, but they made no further application of this principle than to themselves. The benefits of their government in contrast to the evils of autocratic government were so apparent that after the expiration of 47 years, the people of our country had reached the point where they believed that the New World should be held open for the development of free institutions, and so the

president of the United States declared the Monroe Doctrine. From a purely individual application of the theories of government expressed in the Declaration of Independence, the United States had now come to the point where those ideas were in part to be applied to the American Continents. The effects of this new principle were far reaching and changed the destiny of two continents, perhaps of the world. The direct result of this new theory is that the Americas are now almost without exception democratic as to government. This new application of our theories of government was put to the test time and again and more than once we were on the verge of war, because we insisted on its enforcement.

In the meantime a new method of applying the former theory had been developing in the minds of the American people. They were preparing for another step forward, as radical in prinple as the preceding step. Three quarters of a century were necessary to effect the change and in 1898, at the insistance of the American people, not in advance of them, our country went to the assistance of the Cuban insurgents and, after effecting their freedom from Spain, assumed control of the Island for the purpose of enabling the Cubans to establish democratic government and later turned over to the duly constituted Cuban authorities the government of the Island and voluntarily withdrew.

Our government had changed in its attitude towards foreign governments; heretofore it had been passive. It had taken the stand that each country should work out its own destiny, that our country would not interfere unless some foreign power intervened. But now a new principle was established—namely, that when intervention was necessary for the establishment of democratic

government, then our country would intervene and when democratic government was firmly established, we would withdraw.

The History of all the great powers of Europe shows conquest as their aim; not assistance to weaker states. No such attitude as ours had heretofore been taken in the history of the world by any nation. This departure marked the beginning of a new epoch.

This was followed by our direct intervention in Santo Domingo, Nicaragua, Mexico, and Haiti. Along with our policy of direct intervention, there had been developed a further policy—namely, that weaker nations should not be exploited by stronger nations; that claims presented against a weaker nation should be liquidated at fair values; that concessions unjustly obtained from a weaker country could be cancelled. All this was new in world politics, where selfishness, trickery and imposition had always heretofore been present. It is, however, the logical development of the basic theories of our government. President Wilson's Mobile address but reflected the sentiments of our people.

The policy of our government may now be said to be one of intervention whenever the interest of our own country or the interests of the foreign country demand it; but our intervention is not for conquest but to enable the foreign people to govern themselves under democratic forms.

II.

THE APPLICATION OF THE DEVELOPED PRINCIPLE.

The various acts of the German government, which have shown its unfriendly attitude towards the United States, are still fresh in the memory of all Americans and need no review.

That a victorious Germany would put restraints upon our country which would infringe on our liberty is an irresistible conclusion.

When, therefore, the victory of the Allies became doubtful and their defeat seemed possible, unless further assistance was rendered, the entrance of the United States into the war became necessary, not only for our own protection, but for the protection of Democratic principles throughout the world—using the words of President Wilson, "The world must be made safe for democracy."

Democratic principles must become operative in Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria and Turkey.

The governments of these countries may themselves take action and give to their peoples representative government. Many recent events, particularly in Germany and Austria, point in this direction. When the German Emperor realizes that the interests of the German people can now best be provided for by government democratic in form, it is not beyond possibility that he

will lead in this reform as he has led in the reforms that made the German nation, socially and industrially, what it was in 1914. German action along this line would be an almost compelling example to her allies. Moreover, the hand writing is on the wall and if the governing bodies do not act, the people will.

The allied governments have not as yet announced this as one of their war aims, but the following statement by Lloyd George shows that this purpose is present, though not fully formed—speaking of peace conditions at Glasgow, June 29, 1917, he said:

"They (peace conditions) must be guaranteed by the destruction of the Prussian military power, that the confidence of the German people shall be in the equity of their cause and not in the might of their arms. May I say that a better guarantee than either would have been the democratization of the German Government. One of the outstanding features of the war has been the reluctance with which democratic countries have entered it." ****

"No one wishes to dictate to the German people the form of government under which they choose to live. That is a matter entirely for themselves, but it is right we should say we could enter into negotiations with a free Government in Germany with a different attitude of mind, a different spirit, with less suspicion, with more confidence than we could with a Government whom we knew to be dominated by the aggressive and arrogant spirit of Prussian Militarism. And the Allied governments would, in my judgment, be acting wisely if they drew that distinction in their general attitude in a discussion of the terms of peace."

One of our war aims is clear. Germany, Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria and Turkey must become democracies in fact. The form may be a democracy such as France, or a constitutional monarchy, such as England, but democracies they must be.

Another step has been taken in the application of our prin-

ciples of equality and self-government from active intervention in the Americas we have passed to active intervention in the world.

The step is fraught with untold complications and great dangers. A study of world conditions shows that the application of our principles of equality will conflict with the former aims and objects of those who are at present fighting against Germany.

III.

THE FURTHER APPLICATION OF THE PRINCIPLE.

What have been, and were in 1914, the aims of England, France, Italy, Portugal and Russia in regard to colonial expansion?

Russian expansion was for but one purpose, namely, the acquiring of new areas and new peoples which could be laid under the autocratic rule of the Czar and exploited by him and those surrounding him. The interests of the peoples so conquered were not considered and there was no pretense that government with the consent of the governed would follow.

With the change in the Russian Government, if it is permanent, autocratic rule will be abolished and it may be taken for granted that the New Government will advocate government with the consent of the governed, not only in Russia, but also in all other countries, regardless of nationality or creed.

Italian expansion has had in view purely commercial motives and this policy has been carried out without consideration for the interests of the peoples over whom she has assumed control.

Commercial interest has been the reason for French expansion, though during a part of her period of colonization she has been a democracy, no steps worthy of notice have been taken to prepare her subject peoples for self-government. They are ruled

without their consent, for the benefit of the commercial interests of France. Neither education nor self-government has followed her flag.

In Portugal, the early idea of exploitation as exemplified by the trade in African slaves has not been changed in principle, though the slave trade has been nearly, if not entirely, stopped—her subject races receive no consideration.

English expansion has had in view only the financial gain to be derived from the peoples made subject to her rule. In the words of Sir Sidney Oliver, K. C. M. G., Governor of Jamaica:

"Every nation having colonies or external dependencies acquires and holds them for the sake of benefits to its own citizens, whether as settlers, traders, or investors of capital in those territories, and in so far as the sovereign nation orders the government of its colonies and dependencies, the dominant guiding factor in its policy will be the promotion of those ends. The policy of the Government in regard to native races is secondary and subsidiary. The exceptions to this rule are extremely few and such as must be considered to have been in the nature of accidents in the history of colonization."—Inter Racial Problems, G. Spiller, page 293.

She assumes no duty other than military, towards the native populations which she forces under her rule. Her policy in this regard is well stated in the article referred to, page 296-7, as follows:—

"Most of these dependencies have been acquired and their government organized for the purpose of trade, and not with a view to the European colonists themselves becoming workers or employers of labour in agriculture. Nor has the colonising country imported or created the population, as it has in the older colonies. The colonists come there to preserve their economic

interests in such manner as may involve them in the least possible complications with the natives.

Where they live, as in seacoast settlements and towns, in close contact with the natives, they are bound for the sake of their own convenience and health to interfere to a certain extent with the native customs and manners of life, and, for example, to establish municipal governments for sanitary purposes with more or less administrative control vested in the hands of the governing power. But beyond this there is less and less disposition to interfere with the native life and activity, and more and more to confine the energy of government to the departments of military and police protection, to the improvement of roads and other means of communication, and to the education of technical capacity. There is less and less tendency to regard the colonizing country as being under any religious obligation to interfere with polygamy, or other such native customs repugnant to British standards of civilization and morality, and there is more and more a tendency to maintain and reinforce the authority of the local institutions of Government and Justice."

There can be no progress towards self-government, unless the people of a country are educated. An illiterate man can neither understand the problems of government, nor intelligently express them.

England's rule has not been that of enlightenment, or education; her control of subject nationalities keeps them in dense ignorance and so renders a continuance of her rule certain.

England has had the direction of India since 1858. 80% of India's population of over 300,000,000 can neither read nor write.

In Japan, which was discovered to western Europe, at the time England assumed control of India, over 5,000,000 pupils are now enrolled in the schools. In India, with a population 6 times as great, there are less than 2,500,000 now enrolled.

In Egypt, at the present time, where England has had control since 1882, 93% of the people can neither read nor write.

Canada, Australia, New Zealand, The South African Union are not examples of English colonial rule; the peoples of these democracies are not alien races but mostly Englishmen. The English rule of alien races is a different story to which there are no exceptions.

WHAT IS HERE SAID OF ENGLAND CAN EQUALLY BE SAID OF ALL GREAT POWERS OF EUROPE; it is the system, not the nationality, that is wrong.

When no moral responsibility was assumed with the acquisition of new territory; when the right to exclude other peoples from the subjected territory was recognized; when the right to expropriate the valuable mineral and timber rights of the conquered people was admitted; then a race for plunder commenced which has hardly been equaled in the history of the world. National cupidity stopped at nothing except national fear.

Lest the foregoing be considered overdrawn, the following quotations are submitted to the candid reader.

In 1915, Gilbert Murray, wrote a defense of British Foreign Policy entitled, "The Foreign Policy of Sir Edward Gray, 1906-1915." This work was subsequently distributed by the British government. What is written in this book, relative to foreign policies, should be authoritative as to the British government at least. On page 41 and 42 and 46 thereof appears the following:

"To the eye of a thorough-going Liberal there is something sordid and even odious about the ordinary processes of Foreign Policy. There is a constant suspicion of intrigue, a constant assertion of 'interests,' a dangerous familiarity with thoughts of

force or fraud, and a habit of using silken phrases as a cover for very brutal facts. In Home Politics you are working, in ideal at any rate, with a band of friends, bound to each other by the ties of common language and history, by neighbourhood and habits and common interests, or at least, where these fail, by the law and the knowledge in each man's mind that if he maltreats his neighbour he will be made to suffer for it. This ideal is of course, not fully realized—far from it—but it is present as a ground work. And normally all good Germans, all good Englishmen, all good Frenchmen, are in their Home Politics mainly working at redressing injustices, improving social conditions, helping the unfortunate and, generally strengthening or raising the standard of national life. But Foreign Politics are the relations between so many bands of outlaws. There are seldom any strong ties between the parties, either of language or history or neighbourhood or habits; very often there are traditions of positive hostility and mutual dislike. But the cardinal trouble is that, in their relations to one another, the nations have no firm and definite law to control them, or at least no power capable of executing the law.

When I say 'outlaws,' of course I do not mean criminals. These outlaws are by nature just as honest and honourable as other men; they make treaties with one another and mostly keep them, they pledge their word and generally abide by it. But if they do not, there is nobody to make them. If one wrongs his neighbour, there is generally no one but that neighbour to make him suffer for it; if his neighbour wrongs him, he has no protection except his own knife and gun.

If we add to this absence of a common effective law the fact that each nation is normally sensitive only to its own public opinion and quite callous towards opinions expressed by foreign persons in foreign languages, and the further fact that to the average individual in each nation the serving of his country's national interests seems a devoted and unselfish ideal, in pursuit of which a little irregularity here and there may well be forgiven, we begin to understand the curious mental atmosphere, rather like of so many mediaeval barons under an absentee king, in which our in-

ternational diplomats have to move. There is fear in the air, and it is fear that makes men lie. It also makes them polite." * * * *

"The dealings of the outlaw's market may be very far from perfect; they may constantly shock your aspirations after Brotherhood and often outrage your sense of Public Right, but, unless you wish to return to brigandage pure and simple, you must study the ways of the market and make the best of it."

In reply thereto Bertrand Russell, a titled and educated Englishman, wrote "Justice in War Time." The preceding statement appears in clearer form on page 136-137 as follows:

"Stripped of parlimentary verbiage, the fundamental fact about the European situation is that all the Great Powers of Europe have precisely the same objects: territory, trade and prestige. In pursuit of these objects no one of the Great Powers shrinks from wanton aggression, war and chicanery. But owing to the geographical position of Germany and our naval supremacy, England can achieve all its purposes by wars outside Europe, whereas English and Russian policy has shown that Germany cannot achieve its aims except by a European war. We have made small wars because small wars were what suited our purpose; Germany has made a great war because a great war was what suited Germany's purpose. We and they alike have been immoral in aim and brutal in method, each in the exact degree which was thought to be to the national advantage. If either they or we had had loftier aims or less brutal methods; the war might have been avoided."

In 1911, upon the recommendation of the Department of State of the United States, at the request of the Persian Government, W. Morgan Shuster went to Persia to rehabilitate the Persian Treasury. The foreign policy of England and Russia in Persia was, necessarily, a subject of his study. The following appearing in the foreword of "The Strangling of Persia," published by

Mr. Shuster, expresses the foregoing idea in the English of the United States:

"I was deeply disappointed at being forcibly deprived of the opportunity to finish my intensely interesting task in that ancient land; but such rancor or bitterness as I may have felt at the time of my departure has certainly disappeared, and the cordial reception given me on the occasion of my visit to London, last February, and subsequently by the press and my countrymen in America, has so amply repaid me for any inconvenience or annoyances that I suffered during the last two months of my service at Teheran, that no sting whatever remains.

Only the pen of a Macaulay or the brush of a Verestchagin could adequately portray the rapidly shifting scenes attending the downfall of this ancient nation,—scenes in which two powerful and presumably enlightened Christian countries played fast and loose with truth, honor, decency and law, one, at least, hesitating not even at the most barbarous cruelties to accomplish its political designs and to put Persia beyond hope of self-regeneration.

In the belief that the real interests of humanity and the betterment of international relations demand the truth be told in cases of this kind, I have written down the facts with a bluntness which perhaps, under other circumstances, would be subject to criticism.

The Constitutionalists of Modern Persia will not have lived, struggled, and in many instances, died entirely in vain, if the destruction of Persian sovereignty shall have sharpened somewhat the civilized world's realization of the spirit of international brigandage which marked the welt-politik of the year 1911."

The governing bodies of Europe were absolutely callous to all ideas of right or justice, when applied to any people they intended to subjugate or had agreed that some other power might subjugate. The following incident is illuminating. In 1911, France, regardless of the International Convention of Algiceras which

guaranteed the integrity of Morocco, (the United States, by the way, was a qualified signer of this scrap of paper), had by force annexed Morocco and the matter came up for discussion in the British House of Commons. The scene is detailed by Gilbert Murray in his book above referred to on pages 58-59 as follows:

"There is another objection which, I fully agree, ought not to be overlooked. It raises a large question of principle. When Mr. Dillon, in the historic debate of November 27, 1911, remarked upon the fact that in all the controversy about the Moroccan Treaty, 'it does not seem to have occurred to any one that the people of Morocco have any say in the matter at all,' certain members of the House laughed and cried 'Hear, hear.' Yet it is certainly not a thing to laugh at or take for granted, that, as Mr. Dillon proceeded to say, the future of a country should be settled by treaty between two foreign Powers, and that settlement defended at length without 'one sentence to indicate the smallest sympathy with the people to whom that country belonged.'

There is a tragedy here, a tragedy which underlies the relations between civilized and uncivilized nations throughout the globe. The history of almost every European colony shows it in some degree. Civilized man at his best can do great things for uncivilized man, especially perhaps if the difference between them is so great that the inferior does not seek to dispute it. But what the more backward nations very often receive is civilized man at his worst. And probably some of the direst crimes and cruelties that have been perpetrated in the world have occurred in those regions where white adventurers and speculators have been allowed to establish their supremacy over coloured races without the constant control of the Home Government.

The spirit of Mr. Dillon's criticism is therefore very important, though its exact form was perhaps hardly fair. Sir Edward Gray was dealing with the Morocco Question in so far as it affected our relations with foreign Powers, especially Germany. A plebiscite of the inhabitants of Morocco had not been suggested as a

possibility by any critic, and since the policy of the British Government was simply to 'disinterest itself' in Morroco, it could not possibly be accused of maltreating the Moors.

Neither will any reasonable person argue that Great Britian, herself the greatest colonizing power in the world, should object on principle to France or any other Power making colonies. The establishment of most colonies is a history written in blood, and largely in innocent blood. Yet surely none but a paradox-monger will maintain that Australia ought to have been left to the Blackfellows, or North and South America to the Indian tribes? All that we can demand of the British Government is that within its own possessions it shall do its utmost to maintain the welfare of its own subject-races and vigilantly prevent their oppression. This is a difficult work, and we have sometimes failed in it. But, on the whole, judged by ordinary human standards, and compared with colonial or foreign Governments, the Home Government's record in this matter is admittedly good."

Our own government, thru the accident of location, has not been to any great extent contaminated by the evil of foreign colonial policy; we, therefore, viewed with great hope, the peace conferences held at the Hague.

Foreign governments and statesmen held no such views. Read with care the following editorial of the London Times, appearing in "The Two Hague Conferences," Joseph H. Choate, pages 55-56, as follows:

"The London Times which continued at that time to be the great organ of British public opinion, especially on foreign affairs, was especially hostile to the whole performance, constantly uttering severe criticisms upon what was done or not done, and finally openly setting us down as largely composed of a group of second-class diplomatists, who were trying to see how we could best dupe each other. To take its own words, on the 7th of October, it said:

'They, the members, have negotiated and compromised and tried to dupe each other and resorted to all the little tricks and devices of second-class diplomacy' and, again, on the 19th of October, at the close of our deliberations, it said, in plain English:

'The Conference was a sham and has brought forth a progeny of shams, because it was founded on a sham. We do not believe that any progress whatever in the cause of peace, or in the mitigation of the evils of war, can be accomplished by a repetition of the strange and humiliating performance which has just ended.' "

To the same effect is the statement of that eminent Belgian, Henri La Fontaine, appearing in the April, 1917, Journal of the American Bar Association, page 166:

"Is it clear now, to every sane and unprejudiced reader, that the diplomats gathered at The Hague in 1899 and 1907, tried simply to give some satisfaction to the wishes expressed by the peoples to humanize war and deprive it of its horrors and unnecessary sufferings? Perhaps some among them have been inspired by the machiavelic idea that, by persuading the masses that war in the future could be waged with some kindliness, it would be more easy to induce the peoples to accept war as a means of settling international disputes. But they have all agreed in proclaiming laws of war which were not binding or binding only for a short time. It was sham legislation and it was intended to be sham legislation."

How could it have been otherwise? France had then planned the conquest of Morocco; Austria-Hungary, the conquest of the Slavic Adriatic Provinces; Italy, the conquest of Tripoli; England and Russia were then dividing all of Western Asia between them; Germany had her own dreams of world empire. To the governments of Europe the Hague Conferences were a farce in most particulars. Their interest was not in international justice but in international injustice.

The Hague conference did not go to the root of the difficulty. It endeavored to organize a court, based upon a recognition of rights and a standard of duties which were fundamentally wrong. It was a house built upon sand and it was doomed to failure.

Persia, the last of the subject nations which still retains the forms of independent government, appealed to us in March of this year, to save her. She is but one of many. The others are so far subjugated that they have no means of putting their supplications in form.—It is a voice crying in the wilderness.

The seeds of future wars lie among those peoples who are suffering injustice, their revolt is certain. If our national conscience does not compel our action, our future safety requires that we endeavor to establish the principle that all countries and peoples shall be governed only with their consent.

The peoples of Europe will be with us in our effort to establish the principle of self-government. The war has brought home to them what foreign domination means to others. The Belgians have suffered what they made the natives of the Congo suffer. A part of France has suffered the fate of Morocco. The English have been seized with a fear that should give them a realization of what foreign control means to India and Egypt. The masses of Europe will grant to their less fortunate brethren equality before the law and a voice in government.

The statesmen of Europe have been educated to believe that national interest required them to deal with their foreign colonies as property to be handled for the benefit of the commercial interests of their country and that this policy should be pursued, regardless of the interests of the colonies. This education was contrary to their ideas of right and justice and there are many

examples of statesmen who have voiced condemnation of the system and by personal example have shown that its practice was not necessary. Probably the most prominent example was Sir Edward Gray; as chairman of the London conference, to settle the Balkan War, he demonstrated that honesty and integrity could be, with honor, applied to international matters. Even since the outbreak of the war, his impartiality as chairman has received recognition from prominent officials of the enemies of his country. They may now have reached the point where they will lay aside the old ideas and adopt the newer ones—that subject nationalities are to be governed for their benefit; that governments are but trustees for the less fortunate people whom they govern; that they cannot make a colony a closed preserve, which they can exploit for their benefit, to the exclusion of all other countries. There are incidents that show the development of these ideas. The establishment of the Free Trade Zone in Africa is one of them. The quickness with which the European governments agreed to the Open Door Policy in China is another. The more frequent recourse to arbitration is another. All these circumstances show a trend towards the broader view. Since the opening of the war there has been the stand of our President, Woodrow Wilson; the claims of all the governments that they were fighting for liberty; the principles outlined by the New Russian Government; and the last statement by Lloyd George, the man of the hour in England.

"What will happen to Mesopotamia must be left to the Peace Congress when it meets. But there is one thing will never happen to it. It will never be restored to the blasting tyranny of the Turk. At best he was the trustee of this far-famed land on behalf of civilization. Ah! what a trustee. He has been false to his trust, and the trusteeship must be given over to more competent and more equitable hands, chosen by the Congress which will settle

the affairs of the world. That same observation applies to Armenia, a land soaked with the blood of innocents massacred by the people who were their guardians, and who were bound to protect them, and as the German colonies are a matter which must be settled by the great international Peace Congress, let me point out that our critics talk as if we had annexed lands peopled by Germans, as if we subjected the Teutonic people to British rule. When you come to settle who shall be the future trustees of these uncivilized lands you must take into account the sentiments of the people themselves. What confidence has been inspired in their untutored minds by the German rule of which they have had an experience? Whether they are anxious to secure the return of their former masters, or whether they would rather trust their destinies to other, and juster, and, may I confidently say, gentler hands than those who have been governing them up to the present time (is for them to say.) The wishes, the desires, and the interests of the people of these countries themselves must be the dominant factor in settling their future government. That is the principle upon which we are proceeding."—Parenthesis is added to show meaning.—Glasgow, June 29, 1917.

It is but a step from the application of these principles to the Turk, and the German, to the application of them to England, France, Italy, Portugal, Russia, and the United States. If the natives of Mesopotamia are to express their sentiments as to their government, then the Egyptians should also. If the natives of the German colonies are to express their sentiments, then the Moors of Morocco should also. If the Armenians are to have a voice in government, then the Lybians of Tripoli should also. And so should all subject nationalities, including the Porto Ricans and the Philipinos.

If the Turks and Germans are guardians, then all colonizing countries are guardians, and must use the ward's property for the benefit of the ward. The ward must have a place where it can

be heard and in case of a dishonest guardian, that guardian must be removed. Probably joint guardians for nations not fully civilized will be provided by the Council.

If the Turk is trustee over his conquered provinces, on behalf of all civilization, then all nations are trustees over their conquered provinces on behalf of all civilization, and they can take no advantage in those provinces that they do not grant to all civilization.

How very, very much, of the cause of wars between nations this will remove. Think back on the wars of history, take out those that were the revolts of oppressed peoples and those that were for conquest, and count those that are left. It is believed that your examination will show that the establishment of the principle of government only with the consent and for the interest of the governed, will nearly eliminate the causes of war. Then ask yourself whether it is worth while to our country to endeavor to remove the main cause.

We are stepping from being a power in two continents to being a power in the world. Our resources in men and capital will give us an equal voice in the councils of the world. Shall we, as we can, join with a limited number of other nations to enforce our rule, military and economic, over those not so fortunate? This is the history of the past and with it go the wars and crimes of the past.

Or shall we use our influence to make this world a league of democracies where all nations, great and small, receive justice?

The first course can be accomplished with ease and will add to our wealth at the expense of less fortunate peoples.

The second course will meet with many objections, but the justice of it will bring to our assistance a sufficient number of the other Great Powers of the world to insure its recognition.

This should be our second war aim, in no sense subordinate to the first.

Gradually it will become apparent to all the warring nations that a peace dictated by Germany and her Allies, or England and her Allies, will be but a temporary peace; that the separate and national interests of Germany and France; of Russia, Italy, and Austria-Hungary; of Turkey, England, the United States, Japan and all their Allies will receive but secondary consideration in the council which will reorganize the relations of all the peoples of the world. That all must modify and give up many of their cherished aims in order to secure for themselves safety from future attack and freedom to develop their national life, without restraint.

When this time comes, and it will come, then peace with its blessings will descend upon all the warring nations.

B. E. B.

"THE OLD BRICK"
Coldwater. Michigan,
August 10, 1917.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 020 915 844 9

.B55

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 020 915 844 9